A STOP TO A LYING PAMPHLET

Falsly Called

Truths Plea for Infants.

Lately Published by Mr. Alexander Kellie,
in Answer to a Booke lately published, Intituled,

Infants Baptism Disproved.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

In which Pamphlet his very many *Lyes* and *Raylings*, not becoming a man meerly Civil (much lesse a Minister of Christ as he pretends) are hereby manifest.

By JER: IVES, Cheesmonger.

The mouth of him that speaketh Lyes, shall be stopped, Psalm 63. 11.
Should thy Lyes make men hold their peace? And when thou meckest, shall no man make thee ashamed? Job 11. 3.
The proud have forged a Lye against me, Psalm 119. 69.
And the Prophet that speaketh Lyes he is the taile, Esay 9. 15.
Holding faith and a good conscience, which some have put away, and concerning faith have made shipwracke, of whom is Hymeneus, *and* ALEXANDER, *&c.* 1 Tim. 1. 19, 20.

LONDON: Printed for the Author. 1656.

1383:02

TO THE READER.

READER;

THese ensuing lines are sent out after a lying Pamphlet, that so thou mightst apprehend it, and bring it to its deserved judgement; and that thou mayest know it when thou meetest with it, first take notice of its name, which is, Truths Plea for Infants. *Little would a Booke of this name be suspected to have more Lyes in it, then it contains sheets: But herein its much like the Pharisees Cups, that were clean without, but foule within. And this thou wilt find it to be, if thou shalt compare my Book and his Answer together, and observe the places in both to which I shall refer thee, which is all I shall doe at this time. This if I should never doe any more, would be enough to keep the judgement of a wise man from being touched with such an unclean thing. And truly, if* James *speaks true, that* A good fountaine cannot send forth sweet water and bitter, *then the manifest untruths in the Booke, doe plainly shew how little the Author was inspired with the Spirit of truth, which Christ saith,* John 16. 13. will lead into ALL truth.

And if this shall not be thought a sufficient Answer to the whole, I doe assure thee, If Mr. Kellie *will come in publick with his Booke in his hand, I will meet him, if he*

dares, and ſhew him (before as many Scholars as he pleaſes of his own judgement) that there is not any thing in my Booke, becauſe he talkes of my not knowing my Accidence *(the Printers errors excepted, which his Booke is not free from) but I ſhall make appear to be according to their own Rules; and I ſhall alſo before the ſame men at the ſame time, ſhow him how much he hath ſwerved from the known Rules of the Schooles, and Chriſtianity, as though he were a ſtranger to both, as I have in part already done, in divers places of my fore-mentioned Booke; from which he hath not ſo much as endeavoured to clear himſelfe. Thus hoping thou will take this in good part, I ſubſcribe my ſelfe*

Thy Friend, ſo far as thou
art the Truths.

Jer: Ives.

A STOP

A STOP TO A Lying Pamphlet. FALSELY CALLED *Truths Plea for Infants.*

SINCE my present designe is to shew the Lyes and Scurrilous Language of Mr. *Kellie* his book falsly called, *Truths Plea for Infants:* I shall first begin with his Lyes, and they may be called *Legions*, for they are many. Among which take these that follow. The first that I shall mention, is in the latter end of his Epistle to the Reader, where he excuseth his impertinencies by telling his Reader, that *He was to pursue me as a Thief with Hue and Cry over hedge and ditch.* And by this he would make him believe, that I in my Book went out of the Road, in answering a Paper he sent to my house; which is false, as my whole Book will declare, wherein I set down

down all his Arguments impartially in a different Letter, and Anſwer them one by one, that the Reader might know what was mine, and what was his, which he did not doe in his Reply: How then went I out of the Road like a Thief?

Again, Why did not he ſhew me and his Readers in what Page I did break the bounds of Diſcourſe, that ſo he might have juſtified his breaking the hedge to goe after me: Doth not this plainly ſhew that I kept the road, and that he broke over hedge and ditch, becauſe he was afraid to meet with me? I ſhall therefore appeale to all men who know what method is, whether my Book in Anſwer to his Paper, be not more methodicall then his Reply.

The ſecond Lye I ſhall mention, is in the 11 line of his Anſwer to my Epiſtle, where he ſaith, that *I caſt dirt upon the fathers*, becauſe I mention in my Epiſtle ſome of their Errours. How can this be caſting dirt upon them, unleſſe they were not guilty of ſuch errors as I charge upon them? Now therefore he muſt needs be a Lyer in ſaying I throw dirt upon the fathers, when I ſay nothing of them but what he knowes to be true, unleſſe he be ignorant of their Writings.

The third Lye I ſhall mention is that in the 12 line of his Anſwer to my Epiſtle, where he ſaith, that *I doe not ſhew in what places to find their errors*; which is falſe, for except two or three of the Fathers, whoſe errors were generally known, I doe mention the Books, Chapters, or Pages wherein the errors I charge them with may be found, as any one may ſee that reads over the Epiſtle to my Book.

The

The fourth Lye that I ſhall mention, is that in the 21, 22 line of his Anſwer to my Epiſtle; he ſaith, that *I doe ſlander GODLY learned men, as men minding their profits and credits, more then the truth.* This is falſe, for I dare not think, much leſſe write any ſuch thing of GODLY learned men, as to think that they mind their profits and credits, more then truth; no, I have not ſo learned Chriſt: But indeed I ſaid the reaſon why the learned did not find out the right way, in the midſt of theſe many ways, was becauſe of their pride on the one hand, or profit on the other: Now doth this ſlander the GODLY learned, judge I pray, and ſee whether I ſay any ſuch thing in all my Epiſtle. I always thought the GODLY learned to be but a few in compariſon to the vaſt number of the learned; & I likewiſe believe the GODLY learned are ſuch as would with that bleſſed and godly Apoſtle *Paul*, count all things droſſe and dung, that they might win Chriſt.

The fifth Lye I ſhall mention is found about the middle of the 2 page of his Book, wherein he ſaith, that *I cite ſome Scriptures of all Nations, but therein* (he ſaith) *I am no noble Bereан as I would make men believe, in the beginning of my Epiſtle* (His reaſon is) *Becauſe* (he ſaith, if you will believe him) *that I doe not give one place ſet down where to find thoſe Scriptures.* This is alſo a notorious untruth, for both the Chapters and Verſes are ſet down where to find every Text mentioned upon that occaſion, as you may ſee in my Book, page 2.

Again, A ſixth Lye he tells a few lines after, in the ſame 2 page of his Book, where he ſaith, that *I ſaid Infants could not bleſſe.* This is falſe, for I ſaid that Infants could not CALL Chriſt bleſſed, as you may

may perceive by what I ſay toward the lower end of the third page of my Book; for there is a ſenſe in which all the works of God bleſſe and praiſe him, *Pſal.* 145. 10. But doth it follow therefore that all his works CALL him bleſſed? Therefore to ſay, I ſaid Infants could not bleſſe or praiſe, is falſe.

A ſeventh Lye is in page 9. where he ſuppoſeth me to Interpret *Eſay* 65. 20. *as though Infants ſhould live an hundred years before they dye a naturall death, or elſe that they muſt dye in their eſtate in glory.* Both which are falſly ſuggeſted, for I ſaid the contrary, that there ſhould be no infant of dayes in the new *Jeruſalem*, and ſo ſaith the Text; That the child (not an infant in his ſenſe) ſhould dye an hundred years old. Now Reader how that which I have ſaid in the 13 page of my Book, can give a man that puts away lying lips, occaſion to ſuppoſe that either I muſt mean that Infants muſt live a hundred years before they dye a naturall death, or elſe that they muſt die after they come to an eſtate of glory; judge.

The eighth Untruth that he tells, is page 10 of his Book, where he ſaith, *That I like a baſe fellow ſaid, in the 16 page of my Booke, that God makes but a bare promiſe, but is not ſo good as his word.* Indeed if I had ſaid ſo, I had been baſe, but there is no ſuch ſaying of mine in the whole Book. Sure this man might have been called *Alexander the Coper-Smith*, ſince he can forge Lyes to wrong his Neighbour, with ſo much confidence, and publiſh them in Print as he hath done.

The ninth Lye I ſhall mention is in the 40 page of his Book, towards the lower end of it, where he ſaith, *That I ſaid there was no Antiqnity for Infants baptiſme in the firſt three hundred years after Chriſt.* This

is

is false, I said not so, as you may see in the 68 page of my Book, where I have these words (*viz.*) That *Eusebius* who wrote the History of the first three hundred years, doth not mention the baptizing of one infant. I also said in the same page, That the Churches did not receive men to baptism, but upon profession of faith; and also, That infants baptism was no Apostolicall Custome, nor SO MUCH the Custome of those times, as he did imagine. Doth this prove that I said there was NO Antiquity for Infants baptism in the first three hundred years after Christ? Nay, doth not those words before mentioned, and which are found in the beginning of the 69 page of my Book, prove the contrary (*viz.*) That it was not so MUCH the Custome of those times, *&c.* Which plainly shewes, that this error was crep in even in the first three hundred years, though it was not so MUCH their Custome, as it was afterwards.

Again, Did not *Origen* live in the first three hundred years? And doe not I say, page 68, that *Origen* was thought to favour Infants baptism; and yet this man dares to tell his Reader, that I say there was no Antiquity for Infants baptism the first three hundred years; which nothing is more false. However I have shewed, that if some Christian Parents who were eminent lights in the Churches in those times, did not baptize their infants, it much makes such a practice questionable; that's all I brought those passages for; for many errors were crept into the Church at that time, and the being of them then, doth not prove the truth of them.

I ſhall now give a Catalogue of his unſavory ſpeech, that plainly will ſhew what ſpirit did aſſiſt him in writing his Book, which becauſe there was a word Printed in my Epiſtle to my Book, that was not true Orthography, that is to ſay, not truly ſpelt, *that therefore I did no more know what the word meant, then the heele of an old Cheeſe.* * Suppoſe I had ſpelt the word falſe, and that it had not been the Printers Errata, doth this prove what he hath ſpoken, that I doe not know the meaning of it, no more then the heele of an old Cheeſe. Doth it follow that becauſe a man cannot ſpell a word, that therefore he doth not know what is meant by it? As for example, Doth it follow that though a man ſhould not ſpell Horſe aright, that he knowes no more what a Horſe is, then the heele of an old Cheeſe?

* See his Book towards the latter end of his Anſwer to my Epiſtle.

Nay further, whereas he talks of the *Mathematicks*, I know many Seamen that are better *Mathematicians* then Mr. *Kellie*, that doe not know how to ſpell all the tearms of Art belonging to it, and yet doe underſtand them better then the heele of an old Cheeſe: By this you may ſee he matters not what he ſaith.

Again in his Book, page 4. he ſaith, *That I would make ſimple people believe the Moon was made of green Cheeſe; but* (he ſaith) *the Cheeſmonger hath never a taſter to make them find it ſo.*

Again, page the 6 he ſaith, meaning my ſelf, *You are a ſweet youth.*

Again, page the 9 he calls me, *Miſerable bold fellow.*

In the ſame page, about the latter end of it, he ſaith,

ſaith, *He perceives the knavery of Hereticks.* This he applyes to me, becauſe of what I anſwered to his Argument in my Book, page 17. Which if in that Anſwer there is any thing that renders me a knave, read and judge.

Again, page 21 he ſaith, *When my Noſe is Cheeſe, the Cats ſhall eat it.*

Again, page 22 he hath theſe words, *Up Robin, the Ram's in the Rye.*

Again, page 34 he ſaith, *I talke like an Aſſe.* If theſe words ſavour of the Spirit which is from above, judge.

Again, he would faine make us whom he calls *Anabaptiſts* odious, by telling his Reader that we are divided among our ſelves, as you may ſee in the beginning of his Anſwer to my Epiſtle; and that there be none more contradictious then we, both to all the godly learned in the world, and likewiſe to one another. *Some* (he ſaith) *are for the Glaſſe-houſe, ſome for Pauls, ſome for Beach-lane, ſome for Arminians, ſome againſt them: Many that frequent one of our places* (he ſaith) *think it abomination to goe to another of them. Many of us* (he ſaith) *are turned Ranters, and Quakers,* &c. The like you ſhall find in the 36 page of his Book.

To all which I Anſwer, That this is as falſe as the reſt, to ſay that NONE are more contradictious then thoſe he calls *Anabaptiſts*; for firſt, They that are for Infants baptiſm are more contradictious; as for inſtance, Some are *Papiſts*, ſome are *Lutherans*, ſome are *Calviniſts*, ſome *Arminians*, ſome *Arians*, ſome *Athanaſians*; ſome for the ſalvation of all, both men and Devils, as *Origen* was, whom he brings as one of the Fathers that held Infants

baptiſm. See page 41 of his Book. Others againſt him, and for the ſalvation of none but the Elect. Some have been for Epiſcopacy, ſome for Preſbytery, ſome for Independancy; ſome have been Brownists, and have judged it abomination to come to any of his Aſſemblies; ſome have been for the Croſs in baptiſm; others againſt it; ſome for God-fathers and God-mothers, others of them have judged it a Popiſh Inovation; ſome have been for ſports, as *May*-poles, and dancing upon the Lords day; others have been zealous againſt it; for this cauſe ſome of you have cut the ears, and ſlit the noſes, and branded the cheeks; whip't, baniſh't, pilloried, and impriſon'd others, though they have been for Infants baptiſm alike zealous.

Again, how have you Pœdobaptiſts ſtudied to deſtroy one another, and take away the lives of one another, witneſſe the Gunpowder Treaſon, the late Maſſacre in *Savoy*? How cruelly did you perſecute one another in Queen *Mary's* dayes?

And whereas he talks of turning with the Times, who hath been more guilty of this then the generality of Pœdobaptiſts, who in Queen *Mary's* dayes were moſt of them papiſts, in Queen *Elizabeth's* moſt were turned Proteſtants, in the Biſhops time moſt were for Biſhops, and in the Parliament time moſt were againſt Biſhops; and over and beſides all theſe, who are for Infants baptiſm, and yet are thus divided. Let me add to make full meaſure, Maſter Rude multitude in all parts of the Chriſtian world, who are alſo very zealous for infants baptiſm. And yet this man dares ſay, None are more contradictious then *Anabaptiſts*. Can any man that hath not

ſinned

ſinned away his conſcience, ſay ſuch a thing without bluſhing?

And whereas he ſaith, *Many of us are turned to be Quakers and Ranters*, &c. I Anſwer, Who but a man that was minded to tempt his Antagoniſt to lay open his weakneſſe, would have opened his mouth ſo weakly? For doe not moſt of the *Quakers* at this day conſiſt of ſuch as came from the Church of *England*, and were never of any baptized Church? But ſuppoſe they were of us, as it is like ſome were, yet they left us, and their baptiſm too, before they fell into theſe ſtraines; and we have by our dealing with them according to Chriſts rule, left them, upon their leaving the truth. But now what multitudes are there at every Aſſize and Seſſion, both in City and Country, that are condemned juſtly to the Gallowes, ſome for Murder, ſome for Theft, ſome for Sodomy, ſome for Inceſt, ſome for Buggery, ſome for Witchcraft, ſome for Treaſon, who all dye at the Gallowes Members related to the Church of *England*. I doe not mention this as an Argument to prove the falſeneſſe of my Oppoſites Opinion: No, I ſcorn ſuch unmanlike Arguments; for there hath been, and may be bad men of the beſt profeſſion; but to ſhew that my Antagoniſt had mightily forgot the many Errors and Vices of the Pœdobaptiſts, while he was blazoning before the world the Errors of the *Anabaptiſts*, by which he would frighten the ſimple, as though none were more contradious and unholy then we; whereas nothing in the world is more falſe: Though I could wiſh with my ſoule, that we were all of us (which he calls *Anabaptiſts*)

baptiſts) more holy, that no occaſion might be given to the Adverſary to ſpeak reproachfully; who are apt enough to deviſe evill againſt us, though we ſhould give them no occaſion, as Mr. *Kellie* hath done againſt me, laying to my charge the thing that I never ſpake: But this is no new thing, for if they have call'd the Maſter of the houſe *Belzebub*, how much more they of his houſhold?

I have now done with his new Arguments, by which he confutes my Book; and for the reſt, they are moſt of them old ones, which he ſent in a Paper to my houſe, and I have anſwered them in my Book; and he like a man in a Circle brings the Arguments denyed, as a Reply to my Anſwers, as you may ſee by viewing over my Book, and his Anſwer to it: How that moſt of his Reply to me, is but a repetition of what I have already Anſwered.

I ſay again therefore, if Mr. *Kellie* will meet me in publick, let him appoint time and place, and I ſhall juſtifie all that is ſaid in my Book, either as touching the controverſie it ſelf, or any other words that have fallen from my pen, ſave (as I have ſaid) the Printers Errors, which I had not time to correct when I ſent my Book to him; and I am ſure his Book is not without many ſuch Errors; and therefore he hath ſhewn his weakneſſe to carp at ſuch things; as the miſ-citing of ſome Texts, and the miſ-ſpelling of ſome words, although his Conſcience could not but tell him they proceeded not from error of Judgement.

I ſhall

I ſhall now conclude with the words of Chriſt, *Mat.* 12. 36. *But I ſay unto you, that for every IDLE WORD men ſhall ſpeake, they ſhall give an account thereof in the day of Judgement.*

FINIS.